Making Sense of a Strange New World
Conversations with Russian Émigrés about September 11

Andrea Frodema

Russian Émigrés as a Subject of Study

In his book *Russia Abroad* about the "Great Russian Migration" of the 1920s and 1930s, Mark Raeff writes, "The Russians who sought refuge abroad... did so...mainly because their homeland no longer conformed to their idea of what Russia should be."[1] Raeff's words, written about those fleeing the Bolshevik Revolution and the subsequent imposition of the Soviet regime, also seem apropos to another mass exodus of émigrés.[2] Like the exiles about whom he wrote, this other group also departed because their homeland had disappeared, and with that disappearance came radical and unwelcome change. The vanished homeland of this latter group was ironically the Soviet Union, the land from which the subjects of Raeff's book had fled decades earlier.

Like the Russians who fled the Bolshevik regime, people who emigrated from Russia and the former Soviet republics in the last decade are struggling to come to terms with the loss of their country. For many of them, departing was not the realization of a long-held wish. Rather, the decision was made because of events related to the collapse of the Soviet system – loss of employment, anxiety about crime or nationalism, fear of a son being drafted and sent to Chechnya. Emigration, it was hoped, could provide security, order, stabil'nost', those things that the Soviet Union took with it when it disappeared.

The experience of Russians[3] in exile in the twentieth century has held a special sort of fascination not inspired by other immigrant groups, perhaps because of the historically unique characteristics of the Soviet regime and the mystery and threat which it came to represent. Whether we as researchers focused on the spiritual or political need that drove people to leave the Soviet Union, those individuals who escaped became compelling subjects of study. Only this most recent wave of émigrés departed because the Soviet Union no longer existed, and this difference alone makes them interesting research subjects.

In this essay, I report the results of a series of roundtables conducted in New York City to record the attitudes of some members of this group on topics including immigration, civil liberties, being an American, and other aspects of life in the United States, their new country. I elicited views on these topics through discussions on a most contemporary and shocking event, the terrorist attacks that took place on September 11, 2001. While these discussions stand on their own as a response to a tragic event of historical proportions, the broad theme of September 11 also serves as a point of reference from which to investigate opinions on narrower subjects.

Little research has been conducted on this most recent massive exodus from Russia and the former Soviet republics. More émigrés arrived in New York City from the former Soviet Union during the 1990s than from any other country in the world. (according to the estimate by the New York City Department of Planning). Earlier studies recorded attitudes of ex-Soviet citizens in order to learn something about life in the Soviet Union. These analyses taught us that there were norms of the Soviet system which former citizens valued, especially when contrasted with particular features of life in Western countries. Émigrés' criticisms included negative evaluations, such as a perceived lack of discipline among both children and adults, the poor provision of social welfare programs,

[1] Mark Raeff, *Russia Abroad* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1990), 47.

[2] Webster's Dictionary defines an émigré as an individual who was forced to leave his or her homeland for political reasons. That is likely why this word, rather than the word "immigrant" has been used more frequently when describing people who have left Russia or the Soviet Union permanently. I will respect this precedent and use the words "émigré" in reference to the individuals who participated in this study.

[3] I recognize that not everyone to whom I assign this classification is ethnically Russian, and may not consider themselves Russian. Nonetheless, it has long been apparent that Americans designate people not by religious or ethnic community, but by national group, and I am observing that convention here.

and the stock Russian émigré lament about the "low level of culture" (nizkii uroven' kul'tury) in their adopted countries.[4]

While the émigrés quoted on the following pages spoke positively about the United States, certain comments were consistent with those previous findings. Many of the speakers whose opinions are reported here refer to the effectiveness of certain old institutions and ways of the Soviet regime, especially those organs of state responsible for national security. These reactions may reflect a dependence on the old in the absence of new solutions during a time of change and uncertainty in their lives. Some of the reactions reported here also express highly intolerant points of view. Whether the intolerance expressed in these exchanges is based on political, cultural or ethnic bias is not clear, and the comments offered could support any of those conclusions. Of course tolerance in the West, especially now, is not very high either. Our belief that democratic elites keep constituents who prefer less democratic arrangements in check may be challenged in unknown ways following the events of September 11. Americans also perceive a chasm of cultural difference between themselves and citizens of Islamic countries, and there can be no doubt that many of the views expressed by these Russian émigrés are held by members of the American public as well. The difference to some degree may be that Russian émigrés make little attempt to self-censor their speech, a conversation device that Americans employ almost unconsciously; the United States is a society where people have been analyzing their psyches and the meanings of their utterances for decades.[55555] On the other hand, many comments recorded here might be interpreted as evidence that new ways of thinking are being tested or refined. The incongruities and contradictions in these honest remarks are perhaps best read as signs of an ongoing process of internal transition, and it remains to be seen which of the new values will mature and which of the old will remain entrenched.

Today, access to Russian citizens is unconstrained, and Russian émigrés are no longer an essential constituency to researchers interested in learning about life in Russia. This is evidenced by the great number of surveys and interviews measuring Russian public opinion on a wide variety of subjects. I hope this study shows that this last wave of Russian émigrés should not be regarded as a redundant resource. September 11 invalidated, or at the very least violated, the implicit guarantee of stability that the most recent wave of Russian émigrés came here seeking. The words of these individuals indicate the degree to which they are once again trying to make sense of their lives under unpredicted and unwanted change, first, following the collapse of the Soviet Union and now, as émigrés in a country where a sense of security has become more elusive. Their expressed viewpoints can also aid further in our still imperfect understanding of why the Soviet system lasted as long as it did.

Research Design and Sample

The sample consisted of 18 adult émigrés between the ages of 24 and 60, all of whom were born in the Soviet Union. The 18 informants were chosen because they represented a range in ages, countries of origin, and length of residency in the United States. This selection allowed for certain observations to be made, however preliminarily, relating these various factors and participants' responses. While valid inferences cannot be drawn from this sample, any incipient observations could serve as a basis for further research. Each person emigrated legally to the United States, and the majority of the informants were members of what Svetlana Boym refers to as the "lower to middle level of the urban intelligentsia," people who had professions such as doctor, schoolteacher, engineer or economist.[6] While the group is not highly representative of the diverse class, ethnic and educational backgrounds of citizens of the former Soviet Union, it is representative of the Russian émigrés who arrived in the United States in the past decade.[7] The majority of the informants were Jewish or of part-Jewish ancestry. Ethnic Russians also made up a portion of the participants.

There may be a temptation for the reader to assume that some of the stated sentiments about Arabs and Islam are tied to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, given that many of the participants in this study are Jews. While that may be the case, there are several other plausible explanations that could account for statements against Arabs and Muslims, including the war in Chechnya, the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, and the widely documented racist attitudes that prevail in Russia. Moscow Mayor Yury Luzhkov's widely reported comment about cleansing Moscow of "guests" from the Caucasus shows how racial and religious intolerance is promoted in Russia today at the state level. The spread of Islam is considered a threat now in the countries of the former Soviet Union.

Russian Jews were generally highly assimilated into

4 The Harvard Projec.t, completed in the late 1950s, was the first study to present these findings. Twenty years later, Zvi Gitelman reported similar findings in his surveys of ex-Soviet citizens who had immigrated to Israel. See Alex Inkeles and Raymond A. Bauer, *The Soviet Citizen: Daily Lie in a Totalitarian Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959) and Zvi Gitelman, "Soviet Political Culture: Insights from Jewish Émigrés," *Soviet Studies* 29:4 (1977).

5 I thank Cathy Nepomnyashchy for this observation.

6 Svetlana Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2001) 328.

7 Sam Kliger and Tony Carnes, *Russian Jewish Immigrants in New York City* (American Jewish Committee Publication, April 2000)

Soviet life. Every informant in this study declared a commitment to encouraging Russian-language fluency in their children and grandchildren and to educating their offspring about Russian culture in their homes, as I report later in this essay. The term "reversed diaspora" has been used to make the claim that Russian Jews immigrating to Israel are not, in fact, making aliya, but have instead "become diasporic in relation to their erstwhile homeland, Russia."[8] Such findings and theories signal that ethnic-religious identities and civic-cultural identities are complex constructs among the people who lived in the Soviet Union.

I utilized a directed but open discussion framework in these roundtables. This approach allowed informants to thoroughly discuss open-ended questions I posed during the conversations. This type of analysis allowed for disagreement, self-questioning, plentiful debate, and the accentuation of contradictions. Indeed, those contradictions are some of the most interesting parts of this study. Roundtable groups contained six participants on average. Time constraints limited the total number of groups to three. Groups one and two met for two sessions, totaling slightly more than three hours of interviewing time for each group. Interviews with the third group were conducted only once, and lasted for two hours. All discussions were conducted at a community center in New York City where I worked for several years during the 1990s directing an immigrant resettlement program.[9]

Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Reasons for Emigrating

Each group began its discussion with brief exegeses on why participants immigrated to the United States. The two reasons most frequently cited were for the sake of their children's futures and in order to reunite with family members who had emigrated earlier. The words of one woman served as a deft summation of a frequently expressed sentiment: "There were a lot of good things there. Here there is good too. Now, there are more opportunities for the kids to live here" [13]. [10] A retired Army officer unemotionally reported that he held minimal expectations for his own new life. "I have adjusted rather easily because I understand that I have already lived my life and done all I can. Maybe I will find some work, if it's possible" [11]. He emigrated in order for his son to escape being conscripted and sent to Chechnya, and because his wife wanted to reunite with family members who had emigrated several years earlier. Another man who sat in the same group talked about how he struggled with the decision to leave. He and his wife finally decided to emigrate with their two sons after staying awake for three consecutive nights in discussion.

The main reason I came was Chernobyl. It's dangerous to live in Kiev. Second of all, I want security in old age. Third, I came because of my children. I think that American culture is weaker than European culture, but the technology here is better. Things generally run more smoothly here. Fourth, I came for freedom, in the full sense of the word. It is impossible to really define that word. [10]

Several informants, including the three quoted below, expressed varying degrees of resignation, acceptance and hope when talking about their respective emigrations.

I came from Moscow almost 3 years ago. I was dentist, I had my own practice, in the very center of Moscow. I thought about emigrating for 3 years. Should I leave, stay, leave, stay... For us, it was a very, very difficult decision. I came only because of my child, for the stability here. [1]

I came here two years ago with refugee status. I got it in 1992, but I didn't leave. I had no concerns about nationality in Azerbaijan. My reason first and foremost was because my whole family was living here. [17]

I won a green card. I came here four months ago. I didn't think about leaving, not leaving – I knew that I had to leave. In Belarus, there's too much corruption, and a lot of other things. Moreover, our president has installed something like a totalitarian regime. There is no future there. It's impossible for me to work there in my profession, as a lawyer. My father said he needed to leave. He left, and he is doing great here. Here, there are more opportunities open to me. Here, there is a future. There, you don't know what will happen to you on the street. [8]

Six of the participants emigrated from Ukraine. All but one claimed that the "nationality question" factored in their decision to depart. This viewpoint contrasted with that of participants from other countries, several of whom pointed out that nationality was specifically not an issue. The Moscow dentist quoted earlier said that she did not deny the existence of anti-Semitism in Russia, but she as a Jew had not experienced it. She believed that a degree of anti-Semitism existed in virtually every country in the world, including the United States. A woman from Kiev noted the contradictions in her own answer: "The nationality question influenced me, though my girls studied more about Judaism there than they do here. There, they studied in a Jewish school" [18].

---

[8] Tom Trier, "Reversed Diaspora: Russian Jewry, the Transition in Russia and the Migration to Israel." *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 14:1 (Spring 1996) <http://condor.depaul.edu/~rrotenbe/aeer/aeer14_1/trier.html>

[9] I would like to thank Nell Eckersley, Natasha Khomchenko, Yakov Balagashvili and Anthony McCann for their invaluable help in logistic and linguistic matters.

[10] Direct quotes and paraphrasing comprise a large part of this essay. In order for the reader to attribute a comment to a particular speaker or group, I have placed a bracketed number next to quotations and paraphrases to indicate who is speaking. Those numbers are matched to individuals on the "Characteristics of Informants" at the end of the essay.

A middle-aged couple from Kherson, Ukraine, received their exit visas on September 11, 2001. They admitted that they did not want to emigrate, and expressed their hope to someday return to live in Ukraine.

Mainly, we came for our son. He is very smart. In Ukraine, there is no government. We worried about the nationality question–racism–anti-Semitism–we wanted our son to be able to do something with himself without worrying about all of that. We got our exit visa on September 11, 2001 at 11am. Five hours later, the attacks happened. [3]

This desire to return was seconded by a young doctor in the same group from St. Petersburg. He had been living in the United States for nearly four years. He said that he decided to emigrate because he felt unsafe in Russian and could not earn a living wage as a doctor.

I never wanted to emigrate, and I still regret that I emigrated, but there is no other way to live in another country besides emigration. Americans, they can live wherever they want, in any country. I would like to keep my Russian citizenship, so that I can go back there someday. [4]

The oldest participant in the entire sample expressed admiration and disappointment with aspects of life here. She also spoke angrily of her bitterness toward the Soviet Union, simultaneously blaming herself for her passive acceptance of life under that system.

They taught us that it was the best country, but I always hated it, first of all, because of anti-Semitism. I am an educated, sophisticated woman and it was hard for me to advance my career. I did it, but it was hard. Everything took longer. I hated them because the Communists killed my family in 1937, and the Fascists killed my father and brother during the war. I always hated them. I was not a member of the party even though my work necessitated it. I came here late simply because of cowardice. I cannot achieve anything here, and over there, my position was comfortable enough. I understand now that I did something stupid. I should have come here much earlier. If I had emigrated a little earlier, at a different age, I could have achieved something. This is a wonderful, smart, amazing country—the best. It surpasses Europe and other countries too. This is the best country in the world. But the government offices work very badly. The ones with which we have had contact with as immigrants—these offices represent this country, but no one in them is interested in working. [9]

Measuring Reaction to September 11

These group discussions commenced the week marking the six-month anniversary of the terrorist attacks, and the increased media attention served to freshen the images of horror in everyone's mind. To the dentist from Moscow, the event signaled the beginning of a world war, and was a terrible tragedy for the entire world. People in each of the three groups spoke of how the attacks had altered their perception that the United States was immune to such violence.

When we lived in Russia, when we came, we thought that the U.S. was the strongest country in the world—stable, the best defended, a strong professional army—with the oceans–it isn't Russia, with Chechnya close by. But a few people armed with nothing more than a few plastic knives—nothing more—I am talking about the weapons–and with that they committed such a horror. On this earth, a simple person, an average person, anybody, a fanatic, a crazy person, anyone...maybe you can hypnotize someone, put his mind in some zone...can be programmed to commit such an act. It's a shock for the world. It's a shock for everyone. [14]

The couple who received their visas on September 11 witnessed reaction to the attacks in Ukraine:

The attention of my city was riveted immediately on the event. My phone started ringing off the hook because my sister lives in New York. Not everyone in my country likes the United States...it's the international gendarme, you know, etc... but on that day, on television, there was program after program, hundreds of versions of what happened, overwhelming sympathy. People on the street were crying." [6]

Another participant traveled to her hometown of Novosibirsk for the funeral of her father-in-law, a passenger on the plane accidentally shot down by the Ukrainian military on October 4, 2001. She said she was surprised by the level of interest that the attacks had generated in far-off Siberia:

They think that things will be more dangerous now in the United States, that there will be more problems. There, it's very far from America, and something is constantly happening. Here, nothing has ever happened before. Afghanistan, Chechnya, they're already used to it. There was a lot of interest, a lot of sympathy. They wanted to know, "How is it there.... what happened?" [15]

In group discussions, participants reached no consensus when discussing the motivations and circumstances that lead to the attacks. Poverty, the lack of education in Arab countries, ideology, and Islam were all offered as possible underlying causes. The following exchange that took place between three women illustrates the wide degree of interpretation people offered on this topic.

It was just a one-time, big mistake, on the part of the government here, and I don't think it will happen again. I don't think there will be terrorism in America. The reason it happened was purely economic, because of poverty. They envy all developed countries, without any exceptions, and that is why they did it. [8]

I absolutely disagree. It was done for purely religious reasons, and hatred. It is a postulate of the Christian religion...to love...to help. In Islam, it is hate, and as long as that is the postulate of the religion it will continue. At first, the country was completely shocked. Now, six months later, they love Muslims here. They are like our Communists – to the left of left – that we had in the Soviet Union. Now, Americans feel sorry for Muslims. Well I feel sorry when everyone is so happy again. When people died! I was not in the country then. I went to the American Embassy, and when I said I was an American, they were so hospitable to me. (Ne znali kuda menia posadit'.) When I came back here, everyone had already forgotten. Now, everyone is

acting like brothers again. I feel sorry for the people who died. Here, they love Muslims again. Children are jumping around, happy, when so many people died. [9]

She may be right about some things, but I don't think that religion is the reason. I don't agree that all Muslims are guilty. Of course, one of the postulates of the religion is hatred. But I have talked to people I work with—where I work, there are Muslims. We've talked about this at work, and it sounds like you and I interpret this differently. It is really possible that there are economic and political reasons. These are difficult to judge and understand. There are terrorists in countries all over the world. One thing I am sure of is that we need to fight terrorism. [13

A man in another group relied on cultural factors and the diffuse Russian concept of education (obrazovanie) in offering his version of a cause.

Arab mentality is from the Middle Ages. Their civilization and their mentality, which is stuck in the 5th or 6th century, cannot be compared with our modern civilization today. Given this reality, we can't understand the terrorists. They don't understand our way of life. [4]

He also talked about a Chechen professor whom he knew and admired.

He left his mountain village, and he became closer to Russians than he was to his own relatives because he had a European education. It changes the mentality. I like Crown Prince Abdullah in Saudi Arabia. He supports America. He's a truly civilized man.[4]

The words about the Chechen professor, spoken in the year 2002 by a Russian-Jewish émigré living in the United States, are a revelatory example of the amazing endurance of the belief in the righteousness of the social and cultural Russification of national minority groups. This policy was employed as far back as the sixteenth century as Russia absorbed the "open" territories of the Caucasus and the steppe, where conquest was the first phase toward political, cultural and socio-economic assimilation in order to bring non-Slavic, non-Christian people under the dominion of Moscow.[11] Many of the participants in this study as Jews were also members of a Russified minority group, though their assimilation did not occur through territorial conquest. Interestingly, the Jewish participants alternated the way in which they categorized themselves. On occasion, they spoke as members of an incorporated minority, such as when they discussed their experience with prejudice. At other times, as the comments about the Chechen professor indicate, they saw themselves as belonging to the majority. A woman in another group shared this thinking, saying that most Muslims who live in Russia had not turned to fundamentalism despite the difficult economic situation there, because they were *obrazovannye* (educated).

A number of émigrés saw ideology and fanaticism as responsible for the attacks. One speaker who pursued this line of reasoning agreed that these phenomena were not specific to Islam: "Yes, it is fundamentalism. Not all Germans are fascists, and not all Muslims are terrorists. My kids have friends. They're from the Soviet Union, but they are Muslim. I'm Jewish and we have a great relationship" [18].

According to several participants, fanaticism could be a product of any religion or any national group. They cited different manifestations of fanaticism, including Communism, fascism, the cult of Stalin, and Zionism. One man remarked that Zionism in the 1950s was a form of fanatical nationalism not connected to religion [4]. A woman seated near him added that there was still fanaticism in Israel, and gave an example. "Recently in Israel, a soldier was killed. He gave his life for Israel and he can't be buried in a Jewish cemetery. It's absurd. Because his mother was Russian" [2].

Certain views offered by these émigrés on the assignment of blame for the attacks put them strongly out of step with American popular opinion. Two of the three groups talked at length about the mastermind behind the attacks. The most interesting feature of the discussions on this topic was the unanimous rejection of the American government's version of the story, which assigns guilt to Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden. Claiming their sources of information to be either Russian or Russian émigré media sources or "common sense," participants in both groups concluded that bin Laden was a scapegoat. In their estimation, the American government had not produced convincing evidence to support their accusations of guilt against him. One woman believed the videotape that showed bin Laden discussing the attacks was either fabricated or somehow had been spliced together by the American intelligence apparatus. Others around her nodded in agreement. Another participant thought it foolish, even childish, to claim to know definitively who ordered the attacks. The explanation offered by the American government was simply an attempt to keep the public calm.

We know who committed the acts, but I don't think we really know who ordered them, who the *zakazchiki* were. I don't think it's so simple. It's a big question. To organize such an act, such a serious act, it must have taken place on the governmental level, perhaps in intelligence operations working together from different countries. It doesn't matter who actually committed the act. Someone with great power is behind them. Osama is a scapegoat for another person, or more likely for a very serious, powerful organization from Arab countries. It's clear that it's not one person. It has a lot of members. There are commercial and economic reasons. It involved a lot of money...private companies. [6]

[11] Mark Raeff, "Patterns of Russian Imperial Policy Toward Nationalities," *Soviet Nationality Problems*, ed. Edward Allworth, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 33-34, 45.

She later added:

It was the only place in the country where they were protesting about bin Laden. In Ukraine, I saw Columbia University on television. It used as a scapegoat, the only protest. Oh, when people saw it, they said, "Look! Their intelligentsia in *America—they think like our intelligentsia. They aren't so* naïve." [6]

These individuals are certainly not alone in their unwillingness to accept the explanations offered by the American government. Conspiracy theories circulating in Muslim countries have been reported in the American press. One widely circulated theory posits that the Israeli Mosad had prior knowledge of the attacks and warned Jews to call in sick that day.[12] A United States Congresswoman has demanded that President Bush, whom she sees as having hijacked the American electoral system, be investigated to determine whether or not he had advance notice of the attacks.[13] Nonetheless, these viewpoints are not widely embraced by Americans. President Bush's high ratings in public opinion polls during the Afghanistan campaign suggest that the public accepts the American government's official explanation. One participant in these discussions offered his version.

We will never know who did this, who the top people were...it will always be a question of history. Maybe, just maybe, in fifty years, they will uncover something that reveals, which will allow us to understand, who is responsible for what happened. It's common sense. A single individual is never guilty. The U.S. indirectly provoked them. Life here is good, and that's an indirect cause. Why did Muslims do it? First of all, the Christian world doesn't know the Islamic world. We talk about postulates, but we don't know them. Always, the strong use the weak to do their work. There are fanatics in every religion, including Jews, in every culture. They take advantage of the weak, those they can inspire. It really doesn't matter who did it. That isn't important. The root is completely political and economic, and those two cannot be separated. They use religion as a weapon, but it is absolutely not the basis for the attacks. [10]

Two men in another group disputed each other's views on the American response to the attacks. One man wondered if the country's leadership had seriously analyzed why the attacks happened here, while the other defended the United States, ironically by praising the American government's policy of constraint toward Iraq.

America's leaders have to look at why it happened here, especially about their politics. It's the politics of this country. It didn't happen in Rio, or in Paris. It's possible they are making some mistakes internally. They have to analyze that. [16]

Do they hate us? [Interviewer]

Isn't it obvious? They envy us. [16]

It happened here because we are the most powerful country. We can fight against fundamentalism. They know that it is the only country in the world that can stand up against terrorism. [17]

Churchill said, "England has no friends and enemies, only interests." That is the way America has to think. America doesn't need friends or enemies. But how to do it? That I don't know. [17]

Viktor, do you think we are we too arrogant? [Interviewer]

I can't really say, but America has to think about that too. But how? I don't know. [16]

No...I don't see any American ambitions in this direction. Fine, don't be democratic. Live the way you want, but don't touch anyone else. Look at Saddam Hussein. He is still in power. 17]

Two men participating in a different roundtable group also offered contrasting views on the subject of the American response to the attacks. The first man, a retired military officer, suggested caution, while the other urged the United States to act more decisively.

After the 11th, America isolated the government of Afghanistan as its scapegoat for one reason: because it is the weakest country in every respect and the U.S. can flex its war muscles. It's tit for tat. The U.S. government is ready to respond to an attack in any corner of the world. On the territory of Afghanistan they have lost very few people, though the soldiers are living there in terrible conditions, as I well know. They are trying to find bin Laden and his circle. The public is in such a mood now, they granted the president the right to start at "A" and the people around him – his circle – will let him go all the way to "Z." The goals of the United States in countries where Islam is growing, and where in the American view, at least as the spetsluzhba [special services] sees it...well, they will subsidize, invade, establish training bases, at least establish a loyal relationship with governments where there are terrorist organizations. But America has to make a choice about whether to escalate the war inside other Arab states. If the U.S. tries to get involved with, or to start a war with Iraq, Iran or other neighbors, something unpredictable could happen. Middle Eastern countries could unite, even though right now they are busy fighting over the price of oil. When there are a lot of American casualties, then people will think much more carefully, even if the goal is to solve this problem of terrorism. They'll wonder if the president is making the right decisions in his war against terrorism. [11]

After the 11th I wasn't afraid that something else would happen again. I was afraid and am still afraid that the U.S. and the rest of the world will not resolve this. People from post-Communist countries, especially the intelligentsia, really identify with what happened here. They feel now that America is not doing enough to solve this problem. Americans will make a film, put up a monument, talk about it all the time, possibly help with the financial consequences, but they are not taking any serious steps to resolve the problem. [10]

[12] See, for example, John Daniszewski, "Response to Terror Trouble Spots; Pakistanis Buy into the **Conspiracy** Theories," *Los Angeles Times,* 29 **September** 2001.

[13] Juliet Eilperin, "Rep. Cynthia McKinney Implies Bush Knew of Sept. 11 Plot,"*Washington Post,* 12 April 2002.

Immigrants in the United States

Debate on American immigration policy and more narrowly, on the contributions that immigrants make to the United States, provoked a variety of reactions, from anger to sympathy to prejudice. The topic of immigration invited some of the most interesting comments in this study. Conversations tended to focus less on immigrants in general and more toward the subject of Arab immigrants. A young man from Belarus spoke on the subject. "I think that Arab immigrants are happy about what happened here. Nationality is deeper than citizenship" [7]. His fellow group members stated that they, too, were suspicious of Arab immigrants because an Arab immigrant's sense of national identity supercedes his or her loyalty to the United States. In discussing this point, several individuals claimed that the ascendancy of national identity was natural and immutable and not specific to one group. The phenomenon, however, posed a threat to the United States when manifested among Arab immigrants living in this country. In order to prove his point, one man confessed that he too was guilty of harboring the same nationalistic feelings.

When Berezovsky stole everything – he stole from the entire population, from Jews, from Russians, from everyone – on the one hand I know that he's a scoundrel (podlets) but I have to admit that I felt a little proud because he is a Jew and I am also a Jew. This is complicated and deep. Deep down inside, you have nationalist feelings. I have these feelings, and I'm sure that Arabs have them too. [4]

These comments support the definition of citizenship in Eastern Europe as conceived by Katherine Verdery, who writes that in a liberal democracy, the "citizenship" meaning of nation frequently does not coexist with the ethnic meaning of nation. The ethnic meaning of nation, on the other hand, is the definition more commonly specified in Eastern Europe. She defines the meaning of citizenship in Eastern Europe generally associated with nationalism, as "the invocation of putative cultural or linguistic sameness toward political ends and the sentiment that responds to such invocation." According to Verdery, the way in which a people define the relationship between "ethnic nation" and "citizenship" has deep repercussions on a country's form of democracy. Because no state is ethnically uniform, the two interpretations are potentially in conflict.[14]

Another woman in this group, an individual who had been living in the United States for more than five years, offered a solution which unfortunately echoed some of the Soviet Union's grimmest methods of dealing with nationalities: "After September 11, I think we should take all of the Arabs (nabrat' vsekh arabov) and put them in one state. If they want to live in the United States, even if they are citizens, they should be put in one state and live quietly, in an Arab state" [5].

A speaker reacted to that solution by claiming that it was impossible to separate out a single ethnic group from an ethnically intermixed society. "Look at the Soviet Union. Moldovans, Armenians, Afghanis—they're all mixed together now, in families —how can people be separated?" [3] Another group member commented that separating people made less sense from a national security standpoint, because suspicious behavior is more easily observed when potentially suspect people live among the general population. The woman who promoted the "Arab state" theory was unwilling to abandon her solution and offered the following modification. "This is my suggestion. Those who are assimilated, who are married to Americans for example, can stay among the population. Others have to live separately in the Arab state" [5]. "Quick!" joked the woman sitting next to her, "time to marry an American" [1].

Members of another roundtable group expressed views on immigrants that were clearly racist.

Why doesn't America pay attention to statistics? The country is becoming yellow and black. They are good people, but they don't think about their children. What does it mean when an American finishes school and can't read? I don't believe that person is an American. These are the people who are coming here. [9]

What you're saying...it's discrimination. [8]

The person who suffers the most discrimination is the white male. [10]

Whites in general. [9]

Another woman in the same group disagreed, saying that people of any race or from any country should be allowed to immigrate as long as they are educated, and the following exchange ensued.

I am sure that there are *gramotnye* [literate, educated] people in Afghanistan, in Egypt...I don't doubt it. It doesn't matter where they are from, as long as they are educated people.[13]

And who will clean the streets, and who will work on the farms? The literate people too? [10]

If the pay is good, people will do it. [12]

The students will clean the streets. They can study and work. [13]

This is a normal country. The students can do it, and get paid for it...[12]

Yes, I agree. [9]

[14] Katherine Verdery, "Nationalism and National Sentiment in Post-socialist Romania.' *Slavic Review* Summer (1993): 180-181.

Her neighbor advocated limiting immigration from poor countries. "Poverty," she explained, "breeds evil" [8].

I returned for a follow-up meeting with two of the three groups one week after our first discussion. The woman who stated earlier that only educated immigrants should be allowed into the United States spoke first. She had given further thought to her position and had changed her mind. The terrorists were educated people, and she no longer knew what to believe, though she was certain that immigration should not be banned. Her stated sentiments triggered a loud and heated discussion on maintaining cultural homogeneity as the most important factor to consider when allowing immigrants into the United States. These viewpoints reflected, however unwittingly, Samuel Huntington's theory of civilization identity, which sees old alignments that were once defined by ideology and superpower relations as giving way to alliances that will be defined by culture and civilization. In this new arrangement, the West now confronts "non-Wests" that increasingly possess the will, the means, and the desire to mold the world in a non-Western way.[15]

It's a cultural problem more than anything. Think about cultural revolutions and how awful they have been. This can happen when there is a shift in the balance of nationalities here. It's because of the culture that this country has succeeded. [10]

No, people have been coming here from all over the world for 300 years, and only good has happened. There won't be a cultural revolution here. [8]

The problem is that the electorate is changing. When minorities get elected, they are going to make rules that benefit their race and their national group, including allowing more of their own people, their own culture, into this country. [11]

Only one roundtable group voiced a majority opinion that immigrants generally made a positive contribution to American society. One participant, a woman who worked with Muslim women, expressed sympathy for Arab immigrants.

Where I work, there are a lot of Arabs. They are not all terrorists. Many are wonderful people. Yes, for them, it's very hard now. Their relationship with society has changed. In Borough Park [an Orthodox Jewish neighborhood in New York City] there are Arab and Jewish stores. That relationship has gotten more complicated. I work as a home health aide. My patients are Jews. They say, "Acchh...that's an Arab store. We won't go there, even if the prices are lower." [18]

They say it, but then they end up going there anyway, right? [15]

Yeah...their lives have changed and not for the better, no question. Of course, every American connects the act with the Arab world. [16]

This group also insisted that the American government needed to more effectively control illegal immigration and perform more stringent background checks on all foreigners entering the country.

You have to do something to organize it better. You have to know who you let into the country and why they are coming here. But don't forbid all Arabs from coming here. It has to be done sensibly. [18]

You know, I tried to come here six years ago, just as a tourist – as a guest. I didn't get a visa, and neither did my wife, because they didn't think there was sufficient basis for us to return. It's a big problem now in Russia and the former republics, but it's very easy to get a visa if you're from an Arab country. Anybody can come. Maybe other embassies aren't as strict. But it's strange that people who don't always have the best intentions have any easy time coming here. [16]

A man from Baku who was a member of this roundtable group recalled that his own background had been carefully investigated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service before he was granted permission to emigrate. "They asked me questions about who my grandmother was, who my grandfather was, if I had ever been in jail, if I smoked some funny stuff" [17]. Rather than offending him, he said the process made him feel more secure.

Domestic Security

Naiveté, openness and the too-trusting (slishkom doverchivyi) nature of American society were major recurring themes of all three group discussions, and opinions on this topic produced the highest degree of consensus both within and among the three groups. The extreme openness of American society was seen as highly threatening to this country's security. One woman had emigrated from Ukraine only two months earlier, and her viewpoint was interesting because she was actively accumulating new impressions each day. She offered her perspective on the way in which Americans invite unnecessary security risks in everyday life.

Our security was better. I was shocked to see planes flying over the city here. Why isn't there a rule to forbid that? You can count them...one, two, five...In Ukraine, planes cannot fly over cities. There is one approach corridor. Here, planes are everywhere. It's dangerous not just because of terrorism but because of accidents. Planes should not be allowed to fly over Manhattan. [6]

I asked for more "everyday" examples of lax security in the United States:

Well, for example, here you can go to a hotel and give any name you want, not your own—no problem. That was impossible in Russia. The person could be a criminal...he could be anybody. Here, you never have to show identification. You need to be more careful. [3]

Here is an example. My friend works at HIAS, [an immigrant

[15] Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs,* Summer 1993: 26.

advocacy and aid organization based in New York City] and she got caught in the Battery Tunnel after the towers fell. The next day at work a person of Arab descent came to her office and wanted to change his name. She reported this to her supervisor. Before September 11, people came in there constantly to find out how to change their name, and no one checked them at all. In America, you can change your name without any problem. Now we have got to be more careful about that. [2]

The loss of a sense of security here in the United States seemed to make people reach for familiar—if harshly effective—solutions they remembered from their pasts. While no one praised the Soviet *spetsluzhba* [special services] outright, there was broad agreement that the apparatus was effective. Nearly everyone in the entire sample envisioned critical roles for the FBI and CIA in the fight against terrorism. Some viewed the role of these organizations as a counterbalance to the high degree of openness in American society. "Let the population be naïve, but they cannot be" [3]. American intelligence was seen as both the problem and the solution to the weakened security environment in the United States. Several men saw the attacks as a staggering failure of the intelligence apparatus. "To miss such a ridiculously big operation—they haven't been professionals for a long time. Of course they're looking for a scapegoat. You have got to change everything from top to bottom. That's putting it mildly" [16].

Discussion on this topic also centered on whether such change could occur, or if the democratic values of the United States conflicted too radically with the unsavory business in which the organs of state security engage. One man offered his peculiar example of the effectiveness of the Soviet *spetsluzhba.*

During the last wave of immigrants from the Soviet Union in the 1970s, the Soviet spetsluzhba was enormous. They collaborated with the Russian government and sent a lot of Jewish bandits to America. Maybe the Americans should do something similar to that now. It's complicated. [4]

There, they allowed such things...but here, they won't allow it. America has to check people coming into the country more carefully. [5]

Check them how? In Russia, the KGBshniki gave them all clean documents before they sent them here. How could they check? Arab countries could be doing the same thing now. They make them clean...like glass. [1]

America eats up Arab oil. The United States can't discriminate against Arab immigrants because the United Arab Emirates will tell them off and they will be without Arab oil. The U.S. would collapse without their oil. They need oil from that part of the world. That's why the U.S. doesn't talk about these things. [4]

One woman considered how the intelligence apparatus operates in an advanced democratic society. "Maybe a democratic country has a weak CIA and FBI, no? If they couldn't stop what happened...maybe democracy is not about that. The country is concerned with financial matters" [6]. A woman in another group said that in her opinion, no amount of weapons would provide adequate protection in the absence of better intelligence. "America doesn't have the weapons to shoot down those planes? What are we saying? They can knock down a thousand planes. The spying has to be at the very highest level. It could take a long time—ten years. Let them go somewhere and think about how to do it" [14].

Democratic Values

If the discussion on security elicited the broadest agreement among all participants across groups, the subject of democracy highlighted the complex contradictions and conflicting values that these individuals were struggling with internally. Each group discussed the quality of democracy in the United States, and its potential degradation following September 11. We spoke about issues that had been reported in the press, including government restrictions on journalists' access to combat areas in Afghanistan, the detainment of Arab nationals in U.S. jails, and the American government's expanded authority under the U.S. Patriot Act. All of the informants claimed to have heard something about these issues through media sources. In some instances, participants' strong defense of freedom seemed to mask conservative points of view that in reality militated against basic foundations of American democracy. I was reminded several times that my being born in a democratic country meant I could not understand the true value of freedom. "You know, you were born in a democratic country. We were not. God forbid such a great country should weaken. You have to do everything to defend that democracy" [17]. The man sitting next to him at first joked "to make an omelet, you have to break some eggs" (Les rubiat, shepki letiat). He then stated in a serious vein that imprisoning anyone, including Arabs, without due process was wrong, and reminded him of the Soviet Union [16].

Comments suggested that those who worried that democracy might be transgressed during wartime represented the essence of American naivete, and demonstrated a lack of experience with war at home.

I'm against tapping phones, bugging, whatever... you can't do it. But now is a time of war. We lived through wars. We know what it is. [9]

War is war. Bush proclaimed a state of war. Besides, there is no front. You don't understand what war is. [17]

The retired military officer in one of the groups justified the government's conduct:

If a president sends his army to another country, no matter for what reason, it is impossible to call it anything but a state of war.

This is where the U.S. government finds itself now. If you are at war, as any historical example shows us, then some part of democracy has to be put under very tough control by the government. If the government has a basis to arrest and isolate 1,000 people without charges, maybe they are protecting the society and the government from another terrorist act. [11]

An exchange between three participants revealed an entrenched way of thinking in which citizens are viewed as servants of the state.

I think that those people who are in prison, if it turns out that they aren't guilty, and if they want the best for this country, they won't be offended. [13]

They have to understand. [8]

Yes, they have to understand that it was a mistake, it just so happened...but it was necessary at the time. [13]

There is no time now to decide who is guilty and who isn't. [8]

For those who are not guilty, of course, it's bad. They shouldn't sit there. But even if two people turn out to be guilty... The terrorists should have thought about other Arabs here and the consequences they would suffer because of their act. Then maybe they wouldn't have done it. They know that there is a huge population of Arab immigrants in the U.S. and that this act would reflect on them, but they didn't worry about that. Arabs who live here should think about the actions of their own.... it's not a concern of the American government. [13]

Participants also affirmed their faith in the American system of justice. Several comments indicated that people viewed the system to be so sound that infractions on individual rights were not likely to occur:

If they make a mistake, they will pay reparations to them for it. [8]

Don't worry about democracy here...the rules are very strong. The system won't be destroyed so quickly. [15]

If they are listening to conversations, they must have a basis for it. [16]

America is a very law-abiding country. There is nothing higher than the law here, right?

So if they are holding people, they must have the right to do it. You can get a lawyer for free, and he will defend you. You can't say "it's just not fair," and that's the end of that. Not here. [17]

When there was a scandal with Lewinsky, Americans used the law to solve the problem. The same will happen now. Here, it's just common sense—the laws works. [4]

One man viewed restrictions on civil liberties unfavorably in his own country, yet simultaneously advocated the use of similar methods and constraints in the United States. "The government wants to listen to people's conversations? It's like Belarus. In my opinion, for America, it's a necessary measure. There's no other choice. It's OK" [7]. The man who stated earlier that he had emigrated in part "for freedom, in the full sense of the word," offered his opinion on wiretapping:

There is nothing wrong with it. If they don't know what's going on now in one house, how will they find out what's going to happen later in another house? It's another thing if they go too far and use it for some type of financial or economic control. That is a separate question." [10]

People expressed the opinion that the real threat to American democracy was not in violations of civil liberties, but rather in a breakdown of order. Several people provided instances of both small- and large-scale manifestations of the problem, from the recent news item reporting that one of the terrorists had just been issued a visa, to the ineptitude of low-level American bureaucrats. "My ten-year old kid has been waiting for three months for her Social Security card. They tell us 'Sorry, come back again.' In the Soviet Union, we are used to someone answering for things" [18]. Another man said that American democracy was "past its prime" and offered an unusual rationale.

In a family, you always watch your children, and only here in America, do children say that you are violating my rights. What is the biggest problem in America?

The way children are raised and what goes on in the schools and colleges. How did the U.S. rise to be the world's most powerful country? Not only because the best brains fled here from Europe and the Soviet Union, not only because of that, but —it's a historical fact—after Gagarin went up first, the U.S. completely changed its system of mathematics and physics education. They completely changed their system of teaching these subjects. What should be done now? Maybe create Communism again. [10]

Oh God, no!! [9]

I asked for opinions on the negative consequences that can result from excessive demands for order. Several people mentioned Soviet repression, but those who did so added that they had not been victims of that repression.

It depends on whom you talk to about repression in the Soviet Union. My generation did not suffer like the older generation did. Why did the USSR develop? One of the reasons is because there was order. I want to mention the repression from the 1950s through the 1970s, which was awful, and a lot of people suffered. Then, the time came though, when there were limits on nothing. [13]

"One reason the Soviet Union was able to develop was because there was order, and life did not improve when the system removed that sense of order." The same speaker added her view that freedom was something that needed to be properly understood. "The higher the culture, the better you define its limits. A cultured person who comes here knows that freedom means you can work and live normally. But when the dark masses

(temnye massy) come, they don't know what democracy means. They see only freedom. They steal, they take drugs.... [12]

Members of one group acknowledged that their viewpoints on democracy came from an antecedent political socialization that differed completely from mine as an American.

I don't think they're limiting freedom of speech. They're carrying out secret operations. They can't reveal them. You know what Bush said, "You will know everything postscript. [17]

That's right. We're used to that postscript. You aren't used to it. You think there is less freedom of speech, and we think, 'Wow, here there is so much freedom of speech!' We aren't even capable of discussing that subject. [18]

What Does It Mean to Be an American?

When I asked each group what it meant to be an American, many comments incorporated standard definitions such as feeling patriotic and loving your country. A young émigré from Belarus admitted, "It's painful for me to say, but I didn't love my country" [8]. To another man, being an American meant "that you aren't interested in anything outside of your own city." He also defined Americans as industrious and goal-oriented [11]. A man who had emigrated from Ukraine only two months earlier said he had formed few impressions, but had observed that Americans were very friendly and smiled a lot. "They're more open, polite, much more polite to each other in public" [3]. "Americans," one woman announced loudly, "are free, and always will be, and Russians have always been slaves and always will be slaves" [9]. "Yes," sighed the woman sitting next to her, "it's genetic" [8]. In a different group, a man offered his opinion.

In a democratic country, a person is a person. Everyone here has their own opinion, and they value their opinion. People feel like individuals here. In Belarus, I can't say that people feel that way. People here feel that if they obey the rules, they can get ahead, improve their situation, improve their professional lives. [7]

The reason why Americans are polite and well mannered seemed obvious to one man. "They're very calm...they are well-off people. That's why they aren't aggressive. Americans are well fed. They aren't poor. That is the reason why." [4]

Two women spoke emotionally on this topic. They offered their own definition of an American by drawing comparisons between the Soviet Union and the United States.

My life got so complicated when I moved here, literally from the first day, so I had to deal with Americans right away. I don't mean Russian-Americans, but people who were born here. They helped me. They are very warm and I have met with the kindest people. Maybe I'm mistaken. Maybe it was only my personal experience. I have such a warm feeling for them. They really saved my life. It's my personal opinion. Maybe I just met up with those kinds of people. I don't know.

My impression is that Americans have their lives so in order. In our life, well, there is not one American or French woman who could ever imagine coming up with ways to save her stockings (kapronovye chulki). Do you know what I am talking about? Can you imagine? Putting stockings in the freezer? Everything here is simple and direct. There's no reason to dodge or evade here, like in Russia. Work, study, pay, rest. I want to do something, I am on the road to doing it. In Russia, you always had to think, "How can I do this?" [14]

Or, how can I get around something. [18]

Or how to get around it... here I don't have to think that way. That is how the country is designed. I don't know why...I've been here only 10 months. That is how life is designed here, the education, everything, and maybe that is why this tragedy happened here. Americans know only "yes" and "no." Zero, one, zero, one, like a computer. "Yes" and "no." And what if something can be not "yes" and not "no," but something else? Americans go into a stupor. Do you understand what I'm talking about? [14]

And in Russia, they do things any way they can. [15]

Yeah, Russians say, "You can't do that? Hmm....how can I do it?" Here, it is "yes" and "no," "yes" and" no." In every aspect of life, you live that way. And that is why the FBI, the CIA, whoever, thinks that it is impossible for someone to fly a plane into a building, drop a bomb...it can't be, it just can never be...but it can be. How we lived, it was not a normal way of life. It is not normal. You don't have that here, and that is why it is impossible to warn you about such things. Russia...it's Asia...Arabs are Asian. [14]

With her fascinating comment that "Arabs are Asian," the speaker seems to have contrived an imagined emotional geography that supplants political and national maps. Arabs are not Semites; they are invaders from Asia, visiting horror and destruction on the United States, much as Asian invaders had done in Russia centuries ago. I asked her if Russia was Asia.

Russia is both. [14]

Russians, we are a little bit from here and a little bit from there. It's Asia and Europe. Russia, it's between East and West. It's in the middle. It's some of each. That's a frightening mix. [18]

Yes, it's a frightening mix. [16]

Linguistic and Cultural Allegiances

Michael Glenny, writing in 1990 about this same last wave of Russian émigrés claimed, "There is no émigré network or community and they face no lingering questions about who they want their children to be."[16] The responses I received when I asked, "Do you want your children or grandchildren to speak Russian?" seem to challenge at least the latter part of Glenny's contention. During these discussions, I posed the question about language to establish that these

[16] Michael Glenny and Norman Stone, *The Other Russia* (New York: Viking, 1990), 442.

individuals possessed complex identities that obscure the lines between national identification and ethnicity. Each participant was a native Russian speaker, but among them were also speakers of Moldovan, Azeri and Ukrainian. Several could converse in or understand some Yiddish or Hebrew. None of those who spoke other tongues mentioned a desire for their children to speak those languages. The comments recorded below are highly representative of participants' opinions overall on this theme.

They need English for work, but they need Russian for their soul. It's the language of a great culture. [6]

My children have to read the great Russian writers. Russian culture is one of the world's great cultures. In order to appreciate the art, the poetry, the music, you have to know the language. [16]

We'll teach them to read and write. They have to know their heritage. [9]

Russian is a much richer language than English. English is necessary for life here, but Russian is necessary for the soul. [4]

My son is 21, and he wants to read Russian now. All he reads is Russian books. I am so happy about it. [14]

Looking Toward the Future

Comments offered on this topic were brief, and most of my informants shared the opinion that the future would be brighter. "We just have to have faith—in the country, the politics—it is the strongest country in the world. God will help it" [5].

One participant painted a dark picture of what lies ahead. "The future?" remarked the Moscow dentist, "something awful" [1]. Another émigré in her group recommended living quietly, and not paying attention to the outside world. "Don't concern yourself with what is happening outside your door. Maybe this is the way to live" [4]. Members of this same group expressed faith in the Republican administration in Washington. "These people, Rumsfeld, Cheney, Condoleeza, they're a good team" [3]. "I liked the Democrats before. I liked Clinton, but not now. They're weak. The Republicans should hold onto power now" [5].

In talking about the future, one man said that the United States alone possessed the strength to recover from attacks of such magnitude.

I have to say one very important thing. If it had happened in absolutely any other country in the world, that country would have been brought to its knees for a very long time. Only this country could remain standing. Maybe that is why we are here and why we made the right decision to come here. [10]

"The U.S. is a strong country," said a woman from Siberia, "and if it lived through this shock and survived, we will continue to live." [15]

Andrea Frodema received an MA in Russian Area Studies from Columbia University in May 2002. She is a Lead Technical Assistance Advisor at International Rescue Committee in New York City.

Characteristics of Informants

GROUP 1

[1] Female, late forties, Moscow, emigrated in 1999. Former profession: dentist. Currently unemployed.

[2] Female, mid-fifties, St. Petersburg, emigrated in December 1996. Former profession: music teacher. Currently employed as an assistant social worker in an immigrant resettlement agency.

[3] Male, mid-forties, Kherson, Ukraine, emigrated in January 2002. Former profession: mechanical engineer in shipbuilding. Currrently unemployed.

[4] Male, early thirties, St. Petersburg, emigrated in December, 1998. Former profession: thoracic surgeon. Will begin U.S. residency in summer 2002.

[5] Female, mid-fifties, Moscow, emigrated in 1996. Former profession: hospitality worker in Moscow hotel. Currently employed as a doorperson in a home for the elderly.

[6] Female, mid-forties, Kherson, Ukraine, emigrated in January 2002. Former profession: computer programmer. Currently unemployed.

[7] Male, mid-twenties, Vitebsk, Belarus, emigrated in December, 2001. Former profession: lawyer. Currently does manual labor for cash.

GROUP 2

[8] Female, early twenties, Vitebsk, Belarus, emigrated in December 2001. Former profession: lawyer. Currently unemployed.

[9] Female, sixty, Kiev, Ukraine, emigrated in 1995. Former profession: chemist. Currently employed as a clerical worker.

[10] Male, mid-thirties, Kiev, Ukraine, emigrated in February 2001. Former profession: building engineer. Currently unemployed.

[11] Male, mid-fifties, Kurgan, Russia, emigrated in June 2001. Former profession: military officer. Currently unemployed.

[12] Female, early forties, Moscow, emigrated in June 2000. Former profession: bookkeeper. Currently employed as assistant bookkeeper.

[13] Female, early forties, Ukraine, emigrated in 2000. Former profession: engineer. Currently employed as a home health aide.

GROUP 3

[14] Female, mid-forties, Penza, Russia, emigrated in May 2001. Former profession: draftsperson. Currently unemployed.

[15] Female, early thirties, Novosibirsk, emigrated in March 2001. Former profession: bookkeeper. Currently employed as a home health aide.

[16] Male, early forties, Chisenau, Moldova, emigrated in May 2000. Former profession: electrical engineer. Currently employed as an electrical repairman.

[17] Male, early forties, Baku, Azerbaijan, emigrated in 2000. Former profession: economist. Employed until January 2002 as an assistant building superintendent. Currently unemployed.

[18] Female, mid-thirties, Kiev, Ukraine, emigrated in March 2000. Former profession: engineer. Currently employed as a home health aide.